IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU**

**WRIT PETITION NO : 19672 of 2005**

-

**Dated 5th September, 2005.**

Between:

1 Swarna Kotaiah, S/o,.Venkata Subbaiah,
R/o.Nandanavanam, Jagurumalli Mandal, Prakasam district.
2 Kanaparti Subba Rao, S/o.Kondaiah,
R/o.Nandanavanam, Jagurumalli Mandal, Prakasam district.
3 P.Vamsi, S/o.Brahmaiah,
R/o.Nandanavanam, Jagurumalli Mandal, Prakasam district.
4 Swarna Suresh Babu, S/o.Yanadi,
R/o.Nandanavanam, Jagurumalli Mandal, Prakasam district.

**..... PETITIONERS**

AND

1 The District Cooperative Officer, Ongole, Prakasam district.
2 Person-in-Charge, Nandanavanam Primary Agricultural- Cooperative Society, Nandanavanam, Jarugumalli Mandal,
Prakasam district.

**.....RESPONDENTS**

**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU**

**WRIT PETITION No : 19672 of 2005**

**ORDER:**

This writ petition is filed to direct the respondents to receive 383 applications send by Speed Post on 03-09-2005 by Swarna Kotaiah of Nandanavanam village, Jarugumalli Mandal, Prakasam District to the 1st respondent for registration as members of the Nandanavanam PACS and enroll them as members of the society before issuing the election notification.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for the respondents.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondents have not received 383 applications.

Therefore, without entering into the merits of the case, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the second respondent to receive the applications and process the same in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Cooperative Societies Act.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

_____

**(K.C.BHANU, J)**

**Dated 5th September, 2005**

**mrb**

demand the alleged due amount of Rs.1,07,451/- and close the power consumption Meter vide No.1048. Hence the present petition is filed.

None appears in the morning and therefore, the matter has Passover.

It is represented that the counsel is engaged no report.

The learned Standing Counsel for the respondents stated that no demand notice was issued to the petitioner. In the absence of any such demand notice, the question of granting any mandamus does not arise.

Leave it to the petitioner to file an appropriate writ petition after issuing of demand notice.

The writ petition is devoid of merits and is dismissed. No order as to costs.

---

(**K.C.BHANU, J.**)

23rd August, 2005.

mrb